CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Vol. LXIV PITTSBURGH, PA., MAY, 1930 No. 5

SAN FRANCISCO SEMINARY Alcove Case Shelf

Uncle Sam in a White Apron

> **Can a man take fire into his bosom and his clothes not be burned?**
>
> *Prov. 6:26*

From the earliest records of history, the liquor traffic has debased and degraded every class of people who have touched it. Especially has this been true since civilization has been taking cognizance of the harm inflicted upon society by the habitual use of alcohol as a beverage. The consciousness of that wrong, but half formed in many minds, has yet held the maker and the vendor as in a measure responsible for the personal and social consequences of the habit. This unworded, half felt scorn of decent minds has made the old proverb true: "Can a man take fire into his bosom and his clothes not be burned?" The very fact that his business is looked down upon disintegrates a man's self respect. The efforts to hold his position against the disapprobation of society drives such men to devious, crooked and socially corrupting means and methods of carrying on. This in turn further corrupts his conscience and degrades him.

Can a government do in this respect what a man cannot do? Emphatically NO. Its morality disintegrates even more rapidly than that of an individual under this malign influence.

When in the stress of the civil war the Federal Government, in spite of the strong prohibition sentiment of many of the states and over Lincoln's protest, formed a sort of working agreement with the liquor traffic to produce revenue for war purposes, the flim flam game of the distillers, by which they swindled the government out of seven eighths of the taxes, followed. The $4,000,000 beer tax robbery in 1875 crowded the heels of this scandal. Of this period, a Congressional Committee reported, "The whole people know that great crimes are committed with the consent, if not assistance, of government officials. An honest payment of the tax on whiskey would realize $200,000,000, whereas but little over $25,000,000 is received."

South Carolina tried the government selling plan and has scarcely yet recovered from the moral corruption brought on by twelve years of this experiment which was abandoned by an outraged people, because of official corruption.

Every province in Canada is complaining today, because of the corruption of its public officials by a trade that seeks to circumvent a restricted government sale.

In spite of all this, the fatuous devotees of Bacchus from Curran, Butler and Atterbury down to the pimp in the back alley are clamoring to be allowed to dress up Uncle Sam in a white apron, put a bung starter into his hand and make the 48 state governments his assistant bar tenders.

Nothing that could be done to our government would degrade and debase it as would such a course. Lacking already in that homogenity of race, culture, religion and moral standards which are necessary for the highest national development, this diversity of elements would but add to the speed of our decline.

Corruption of officials we may have today. It would be amazing if it were otherwise, when we contemplate how the wet block in Congress packed the enforcement bureau under the Harding administration. But this corruption, which is being rapidly weeded out, is not a circumstance to what would happen to Uncle Sam if the fire of government sale is taken into his bosom. Not even German war hate could wish worse upon our country.

The Days of Auld Lang Syne

AMERICANS are notorious for having short memory in political matters. If a public servant can survive condemnation for a year, time wipes out the score against him, unless his party turns him down. Memory of conditions and causes is but little longer. This short memory has given us a reputation for vacillation and an utter lack of continuity and consistency in public policies. It is this national characteristic, which constitutes the chief danger to prohibition today. The generation which knew the American saloon will never consent to its coming back. They know equally well that the volume of trade which was carried on by the saloon can never be brought back and legalized without restoring the sales end of it in some form. This picture of what the saloon was, should be kept before the coming generation with an explanatory sub-title, "Lest we forget, lest we forget."

About thirty years ago, the writer of these lines was commissioned both by the Illinois Christian Endeavor Union and the Presbyterian Synod of Illinois to prepare some material for use in the prohibition war, as it was then being carried on. He at once went on the subscription list of three liquor trade papers, "The Brewer's Journal," "The Wine and Spirit Gazette" and the "Champion of Fair Play," which was the organ of the saloons of Chicago. This picture of the saloon and the trade, is what they themselves drew. When men in any unethical cause quarrel among themselves, the truth is pretty sure to come out; and the three branches of the trade did quarrel.

One of the most frequent assertions today is that the bootleg trade equals or surpasses the old legalized trade. Well, here is a headline from the Champion of Fair Play in 1900.

"Twenty-two miles of Saloon Frontage in Chicago Today, every foot of which pays taxes to the city."

This of course did not include the breweries. At that time there were 6,341 licensed places and 2,071 known speakeasies. The latter were mostly vice resorts, fences and billard halls which paid graft instead of license. Bad as it may be under "Big Bill," Chicago has no such trade as that today.

In 1919 the Brewers' Annual carried an article on the extent of the beer trade, stating that it used the produce of 7,500,000 acres of barley and about 40,000 acres of hops. The statistics for that year were 1,800,000,000 gallons of beer, 180,000,000 gallons of distilled liquor and 33,000,000 gallons of wine. We all know that there is illicit manufacture and sale today, but no one but a fool, an ignoramus or a liquor propagandist would assert that there is any such volume of trade today. It does not reach the distilled liquor mark of that day, let alone the beer and wine.

Another common assertion today is, that it is poisoned booze that is killing the people. "In the good old days of the saloon, when it was posssible to get good liquor it was not so."

Well, take this from the Wine and Spirit Gazette, in 1900. "Why do our brewers not drink beer? Can it be because they know the component parts of the beer they make? On this point it is proper to call attention to a circular recently received at our office from the E. Bergenhansen Chemical Co. of Cincinnati, Ohio, which affords a glimpse of the secret operation of some of our breweries. This circular announces that the E. B. C. Co. are the makers of bisulphite of soda, beer coloring, salicylic acid and kalium-meta-sulphite as "preservatives of beer."

Or take this from the Liquor Trades Review of 1900. "It is considered and understood that all beer brewed in New York as well as in most states, would not pass muster under a pure beer law, and if brewed in some parts of Germany would land the brewers in jail."

We remember distinctly, though unfortunately the clipping has not survived, a description by a brewer of the place of manufacture of a certain brand of whiskey. It was a fourteen foot square cellar, where alcohol was chemically treated, watered, colored and sold, as genuine, aged in the wood, whiskey to the trade.

The present day moonshiners are simply carrying on as they learned to do under the old licensed trade. The leopard has not changed his spots. He is simply trying to capitalize them today. It is also charged that prohibition is corrupting the morals of government officials today and thus ruining the country. Read this from the trade organ "South West," 1899.

"It is a sad reflection on the times, but it is true nevertheless, that money is about the only thing that talks forcefully and entertainingly these days. It entertains the lawyer, enthuses the lobbyist and jollies the newspaper publisher, until he can scarcely restrain himself. Especially sweet and attractive to the ear of the average legislator, is jingling money's soft and dulcet voice. The distillers of the country recognize this fact. They are going after a reduction to .70 of the $1.10 whiskey tax. They have raised a fund of $20,000 to be devoted to this purpose."

Old letters are often interesting. Note the date on this one.

Detroit, Mich., Jan. 16, 1899.
Col. August Goebel,
Goebel Brewing Co., City.

Dear Sir: In accordance with your kind offer, will you please ship one barrel of quart bottles of beer to Mose Parshalsky, sergeant at arms of the Senate. This is for use of the Senate Bar, which is maintained on the quiet in the sergeant at arm's room. Also two cases of pints to W. D. Kelly, 218 Capital Ave. One case of pints to Jno. R. Gordon 602 Ottawa St. These are all members and men I am counting on to help me out. I would suggest to some of the other brewers that they offer to do something in this line. I am already besieged by members, requesting supplies. They know there is no money this year, so they think they ought to have booze. All is a robber game, but I don't see how we can get out of it.

Yours respectfully,
Lew J. Burch.

That was a bad year and money was scarce, but hear it clink in this one. The peculiar phraseology locates this transaction, during the Boer War. It was clipped from the **Champion of Fair Play** and gives one of their sample fair plays.

"The Clark local option Bill which has been before the Ohio legislature for some weeks was finally defeated by a majority of one. The bill passed the House, and all the energy of the liquor trade has been concentrated on the Senate, to secure its defeat.

"The officers of the Ohio State Liquor League became discour-

aged. Count as best they could, they could see nothing before them but defeat by two votes. National President John Weiss, who lives in Canton, Ohio, appealed to his brother officers of the National Association. He was prompty answered by that gallant soldier in the cause of personal liberty, Senator Schweickhardt, who from his kopje in Central Park, St. Louis, brought his Long Tom into position and fired a few effective shots into the enemy's camp. A few well directed shots were fired from Illinois and Kentucky did some fancy shooting with marked effect; and the result was that by Tuesday evening the prospects of success were brighter and when the vote was taken Wednesday, the Bill was defeated."

That last vote cost them $20,000. Those "shots" amounted to $50,000. This is the picture of separate states fighting a national organization. Yet it is this condition that Nicholas Murray Butler, Al Smith, Governor Ritchie and Teddy Edwards are having the effrontery or the asininity to ask the country to go back to. This old note book has several more pages along that line, but we must pass on.

"But," they will say, "there is one thing you must admit prohibition has changed, **that is**, a law-abiding, tax-paying business, to bootlegging. Prohibition has created the bootlegger." Two things this old book shows. There were as many bootleggers then as now, and the liquor trade never was a law abiding business.

At the hearing on the Raines Law in 1916 Morris Tekulsky, President of the New York Liquor Dealers Association said:

"There are more unlicensed places in New York, than there are licensed."

Senator Raines of New York fixed the number in his report between 4,000 and 5,000. We doubt if there are more now. At that same time, 1900, there was in Pennsylvania a discrepancy between the Brook's Law licenses and the Federal permits of 37,000. Allowing that 5,000 of these Federal permits (a liberal estimate) for duplications and transfers, you have 32,000 bootleggers for Pennsylvania, in addition to the open saloons.

In a legislature investigation about that time in Philadelphia, it was shown that there was 1,600 retail licensed hotels and 1,012 unlicensed joints. At the hearing, Richard Patterson, President of the Pennsylvania Liquor Dealers As-

(*Continued on page 8, col. 3*)

Dry Points

FIRST CONGRESSIONAL WET AND DRY HEARING

February 12 to April 16, 1930

THE Wet and Dry Hearing before the House Judiciary Committee of Congress was a scheme of the wets to reach the American people, through the aid of the wet metropolitan press, with their propaganda against national prohibition. The wet chairman of this dry Committee arranged for the hearing without consulting the members of his Committee. In an unjudicial address in opening the hearing in which he denounced prohibition, Chairman Graham said he proposed in this hearing to give those opposed to prohibition an "Open Forum" in which to present their side of the case to the American people.

Notwithstanding this setup, so pertinent and overwhelming was the testimony introduced by the drys in refutation of that presented by the wets, that the hearing will prove to be a boomerang to the wets—provided the testimony presented in support of national prohibition is given to the American people.

Prosperity and Prohibition

Mr. Samuel Crowther, outstanding authority and writer on economic and business subjects, made an extensive survey of the economic effects of prohibition. He testified:

"I found that the net diversion of spending brought about by prohibition—that is, money which now goes into goods and savings instead of over saloon bars—amounts to between **$2,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 a year**, and that at the smallest estimate the country has diverted around **$15,000,000,000 since the Amendment went into effect.** This diversion is of double importance, for it has occurred in the lower income groups where formerly the percentage expenditure for liquor was the largest."

Life Insurance and Prohibition

Hon. John J. Lentz, former Congressman from Ohio, founder of the American Insurance Union and its President since its foundation 30 years ago, testified that since the adoption of national prohibition the death rate of those **insured in 77 of the leading insurance companies** dropped to a point **20% below that of the saloon days.**

"For the year 1928 the **Expected Cost** to these 77 companies of the insured lives was $542,547,786 while the **Actual Cost** was only $308,669,129, or a saving of $233,878,657, a fair percentage of which should be credited to prohibition of the saloon."

Mr. Louis J. Taber, Columbus, Ohio, Master of National Grange:

"It took 79 years for life insurance to total $50,000,000,000 under the legalized liquor traffic. It took only 6½ years under prohibition to bring the total beyond the $100,000,000,000 mark."

Salvation Army and Prohibition

Commander Evangeline Booth testified:

"Every woman officer in charge of our numerous Homes devoted to our Maternity and Rescue Work is unalterably committed to the prohibition course as bringing a most important contribution towards the solving of the girl problem.

"Our Bowery workers in New York still declare without the slightest hesitation that conditions are fully 70% better in every way than before the Prohibition Law was enacted.

"Suffice it to say that the whole of The Salvation Army Officership, being more than 4,800, having charge of our work in some 1,700 stations, to which are attached tens of thousands of lay workers, and 270 Social Institutions wherein were sleeping last night some 16,000 persons, in this country are a positive unit in the realization that the policy of prohibition adopted by the people has been an unmixed blessing."

Youth and Prohibition

Prof. Fielding H. (Hurry Up) Yost, Director of Physical Education, University of Michigan, sent this telegram, "In my opinion the college youth of America are not drinking as much as they did in pre-prohibition days."

Amos Alonzo Staff, veteran football coach of the University of Chicago, testified:

"Last Saturday the athletic directors of the Intercollegiate Western Conference met at Minneapolis. We discussed drinking conditions in our respective institutions. We agreed that there were small groups of men who drank, some of them to excess, but we were unanimous that conditions were getting better each year and that the great

(*Continued on page 5, col. 1*)

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Founded in 1867

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASS'N,

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Monthly at the Association's Headquarters, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

WM. PARSONS, Associate Editor

Rates, $1.00 the year, payable in advance, Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa. under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The Literary Digest Straw Vote

The Literary Digest prohibition poll is attracting nation-wide attention and doubtless influencing the attitude of many people toward prohibition.

Is it giving a true reflection of the sentiment of the country on the prohibition question? We contend it is not for the following reasons:

1st: It is evident to all who know the psychology of the human mind that those who want something and do not have it, are far more interested in straw votes than those who have what they want. The Drys have prohibition in the Constitution and the Volstead Act on the statute books. This is what they want. They have it. Why should they concern themselves about a straw vote, which no matter how it turns out, isn't going to take prohibition out of the Constitution or off the statute books. The Wets are very much against both the 18th Amendment and the Volstead Law. They want to get rid of both. They haven't been making headway by real voting, so they are very keen to express themselves in a straw vote involving this issue. It is at least a way of expressing their opposition and besides it might lead to something.

2nd: The poll was timed, whether intentionally or not we do not say, nor know, so that the Wets have the distinct advantage.

The bulk of the ballots went out just at the time when the flood of propaganda of the Wets against prohibition presented at the Wet and Dry Hearing before Congress was being given to the country and before the testimony of the Drys had been presented to the Committee and given to the country. In addition the Digest poll was put on at the culmination of a wet campaign of at least six months duration, which for magnitude and virulence is without precedent in the history of the prohibition movement. When this prolonged and vociferous clamor of the Wets was at its height, the Digest ballots were sent out—a most opportune time for the Wets.

3rd. The ballots have gone out to men in very much larger numbers than to women. Tests to determine this have been made in many gatherings and the results have shown that at least three men receive a ballot to every one woman. This is due to the fact that the names of those to whom ballots are sent are obtained largely from telephone books and from lists of automobile owners and drivers and far more telephones and autos are listed in men's names than in women's.

It is conceded on all hands that a much larger proportion of women than men are dry.

4th: The ballots have been sent out in a loose way. The 20,000,000 ballots sent out have not gone to 20,000,000 different people. We know of persons who have received two, four, six ballots and of others —prominent people—who received none.

5th: In a former Digest prohibition poll in which there was an opportunity in important states to make an accurate check on the result of the Digest poll, it proved to be far wide of the mark.

In 1922 the Digest conducted a similar prohibition straw vote. The final announcement of the result of this vote was on September 9th. Two months later in the November election, there was a real vote on prohibition in Ohio and California. The Digest vote indicated Ohio was wet as only 44.2% favored prohibition, but in the election Ohio voted dry by a majority of 189,000. In California, according to the straw vote, prohibition was favored only by 35% of the people but in the state election it had 33,000 more than a majority.

Since 1922 binding referenda have been held in five states. In these states the Digest poll gave prohibition enforcement an average of only 35%. In the actual elections, the vote for enforcement was more than 52% greater than the Digest straw vote indicated.

For the above reasons we believe the Digest poll should be given little weight for it does not truly reflect the sentiment of the country on prohibition. Nevertheless, it is doing much harm and the friends of prohibition instead of being discouraged by it should be stimulated to greater efforts on behalf of the maintenance and effective enforcement of the 18th Amendment.

It is most unfortunate that following President Hoover's appeal to the people for cooperation and support in the efforts of his administration to enforce national prohibition, when all good citizens should "stand by the President," that the Literary Digest should thus lend "aid and comfort" to those who are doing all within their power to defeat the President's efforts and destroy this most humane piece of legislation ever enacted in the history of our country.

Help Circulate Dry Points

We ask for the cooperation of all our temperance friends in giving a wide circulation to the 3 articles in this issue of The Christian Statesman entitled "Dry Points in the Congressional Wet and Dry Hearing." In these articles the high points have been gleaned from the testimony presented to the Committee of Congress by the Dry witnesses and brought together in these articles which are now available in leaflet form.

The Wets set up this Congressional hearing to use the Judiciary Committee of the House as a sounding board to reach the people of the entire country with their propaganda against prohibition. With the magnificent support they received from the wet metropolitan press, they have been eminently successful in accomplishing their purpose. It is possible, however, to turn this publicity scheme of the Wets into a boomerang for them. The testimony presented by the Drys proved to be so strong and convincing, and on some points so overwhelming, that if we get it to the American people, it will more than counteract all the damage done by the wet propaganda.

Some of the newspapers, even though wet, gave their readers as fair and full reports of the dry testimoney as that presented by the Wets but many of them did not. It is for us who are temperance leaders to get this testimony to the people no matter how difficult this may be. The Christian Statesman is endeavoring to meet its share of responsibility in this matter. We ask our readers to secure copies of these leaflets and distribute them as widely as possible among their personal friends and in the organizations with which they are connected.

Throughout the churches of the

country on May 18th the subject of Temperance will be studied in Sabbath Schools. These leaflets will provide excellent material for teachers and also will be very serviceable for general distribution on this day. Order them from The National Reform Association, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa. Ten cents (10¢) for the series of three leaflets, or at the rate of $2.00 per hundred for each leaflet, or for 100 sets of the leaflets, $5.00.

DRY POINTS

(Continued from page 3)

mass of students were sensible and self-disciplined. Several directors stated that drinking was not a real problem in their institutions. I can state with absolute confidence that it is not a problem at the University of Chicago, that only a very small percentage of the students drink at all."

Dr. Daniel Poling, President of the World's Christian Endeavor Union said:

"From personal contact with thousands of young people in every state of the Union, from a radio correspondence covering the nation and from intimate observation of life in Park Avenue as well as in Main Street, I record the conviction that there is less drinking among young people than there has been at any time in the past 8 years."

The National Education Association at the request of President Hoover's Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, undertook an investigation to show behavior conditions in the high schools of the country comparing 1930 with 1920.

Dr. Poling introduced a statement from Secretary J. W. Crabtree, of the Association, to the effect that while the investigation is not complete, "enough reports have come to show that conditions in the high schools are much better than in 1920 with respect both to drinking and general behavior."

"Since 1920 the high school enrollment has grown from 2,000,000 to more than 5,000,000 students. Many of the 3,000,000 additional students who have sought a high school education within the decade have come from poor homes where in former times drinking was a heavy burden on the family income. Unquestionably the 18th Amendment has benefited the schools beyond measure."

The Grange and Prohibition

Louis J. Taber, Master of the National Grange testified:

"Sixty years ago the Grange declared for temperance. Forty years ago we opposed the legal saloon; 15 years ago we declared for national prohibition and every session of the National Grange since 1920 has gone on record in opposition to the repeal of the 18th Amendment."

The Grange has a membership of 1,000,000.

Women and Prohibition

Mrs. John F. Sippel, President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs (with a membership of 3,000,000), testified that each year since the adoption of the Amendment the Federation has gone on record as favoring prohibition through resolutions presented and adopted at its annual meetings.

On two occasions—1924 and 1926—after full discussion of the resolution, the vote was taken twice, the women rising solemnly in the second vote, and on both occasions the vote was unanimous.

Mrs. Henry W. Peabody, National Chairman of the Woman's National Committee for Law Enforcement comprising 30 women's organizations, presented to the Judiciary Committee the representatives of these 30 organizations each of whom urged the retention and enforcement of the Amendment. She also presented a 14 point prohibition creed drawn up by the representatives of these organizations expressing in strong terms their convictions in favor of national prohibition.

The combined membership of these 30 organizations is 12,000,000. Page Mrs. Charles H. Sabino!

As a final reason why the 18th Amendment will not be either repealed or modified **Colonel Raymond Robbins** cited the 19th, or Woman Suffrage, Amendment. "If men put the 18th Amendment in the Constitution women will keep it there. Arithmetic is on our side."

SECOND

Dry Points

CONGRESSIONAL WET AND DRY HEARING

February 12 to April 16, 1930

Lawlessness and Prohibition

Col. Raymond Robbins, Chicago and New York.

"It is claimed that because of prohibition, there has been increased lawlessness in America. There is an increase of crime in our nation. This is the fact. The reason given is false. In all the nations that participated in the Great War, we find an increase in crime. We are the only one of these to outlaw the liquor traffic. Therefore, the crime and lawlessness of this hour must have another and universal cause. It is an aftermath, a backwash of the Great War. Millions of the youth of great nations, taught to disregard the life and property of the alien, now allow their appetites and greed for gain free dominion under a wave of force and disregard for law and authority."

Speakeasies and Prohibition

Hon. John J. Lentz, former Congressman from Ohio and President of the American Insurance Union:

"The advocates of repeal and modification are making much adieu about the evils of bootleggers and bootlegging. Bootlegging is not a new industry. In the days before prohibition the saloon keepers of Cincinnati appealed to the authorities of the city to protect them against bootleggers. Officials of the city of San Francisco estimated frequently that speakeasies and blind tigers outnumbered the licensed saloons before prohibition. One of the problems of London, England today is to stop bootlegging. Even in Canada they are bootlegging."

H. J. Haskell, Editor, Kansas City Star:

"A survey made in Kansas City 20 years ago showed 3,000 places selling liquor, 2,400 without city licenses and numerous beer wagons selling at retail on streets illegally."

Chicago Tribune, January 8th, 1900—(30 years ago):

"An investigation of the wets reveals that 8,502 places are licensed to sell liquor (in Chicago) by the United States Collector of Internal Revenue. The saloon licenses issued total 6,431 leaving 2,071 places that sell liquor and do not pay the city license fee of $500.00."

Daniel C. Roper, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue:

"In February, 1902, nine years after the South Carolina Dispensary Law went into effect, the records of the United States Collector of Internal Revenue of South Carolina show that there were in the state 444 retail liquor dealers whereas there were but 104 local dispensaries."

That is under Government Control, such as the wets are advocat-

(Continued on page 6, col. 3)

Mrs. Shephard's Letter

After two months in campaign work against the Mormon propaganda in Florida, Mrs. Pritchard and I are back in Philadelphia to continue our campaign in this city and vicinity.

Have been speaking at district conventions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Have spoken not only to the older members, but have been privileged to address the young women's organizations and warn them about the dangerous work of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Most sincere, hearty and prayerful cooperation has been given throughout the meetings. We will remain here until our message has reached every part of this city of **Brotherly Love.**

The Mormon Church has just closed a celebration of one hundred years of Mormonism. The Church was founded by Joseph Smith at Fayette, Seneca County, New York, on April 6, 1830, with six members and they acknowledge today a membership of approximately seven hundred thousand persons, and with one hundred **stakes of zion** (a stake represents something like a county organization would to us). The church has seven hundred ecclesiastical wards and twenty-seven foreign missions. This one hundredth anniversary is attracting world-wide attention. One of their speakers, in summing up the founding of the church, gave this short resume of its beginning:

"Joseph Smith at fourteen years of age was profoundly effected by the excitement over religion, with a desire in his heart to know which of the many churches was the true church; he went into the woods on a spring morning in 1820 to pray when he saw before him **two Personages.** The elder of the two, pointing to the other said, 'This is my Beloved Son, hear Him.' In answer to his question, Joseph Smith declared he was advised, 'to join none of them, for they were all wrong.'"

On the night of September 21, 1823, he claims, while he was praying in his bedroom, a personage appeared, who announced himself as Moroni, an angel sent from the presence of God, and told Joseph that he would find some golden plates in a hill near Manchester, which would give an account of the origin and history of the ancient inhabitants of the American continent, the ancestors of the American Indians.

Joseph met the angel the next morning at the hill Curmorah and he was shown the golden plates but was not permitted to remove them. He was instructed to meet the angel at the hill **once** each year until 1827 when the plates were delivered to him. Joseph, with the assistance of a school teacher, Oliver Cowdery, claimed he was able to translate the hieroglyphics on the golden plates into the "Book of Mormon which is the **true Bible** of the Mormon Church." This book is accepted with **greater belief** than our Bible, which the Mormons accept only "so far as it is **translated correctly.**" They get the name "Mormon" from their bible—for Mormon was a great general and mighty leader and wrote their bible.

Some of the outstanding features, which they have been celebrating, are the restoration of Aaronic priesthood in June, 1829, by the Apostles Peter, James and John; the appearance in the Temple at Kirtland, Ohio, April 3, 1836, of the Lord Jesus Christ and Moses, who restored the keys for the gathering of Israel; the coming of this **same temple** of Elias, who committed the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham, and Elijah who delivered the keys for "the turning of the hearts of the fathers to the children and the hearts of the children to the fathers." This work of Elijah was the beginning of the vicarious work for the dead through baptism, by immersion, in behalf of their departed loved ones, by some one still on earth.

Leaving Kirtland, Ohio, Joseph Smith established headquarters at Nauvoo, Illinois, May 10, 1839; and on April 12, 1843, he received his revelation on plural marriage; and on June 27, 1844, Joseph and his brother Hiram were assassinated in the jail at Carthage, Illinois. "The mantle of Joseph" fell upon Brigham Young in the spring of 1846; and Brigham led the Mormons on their great exodus from Nauvoo, arriving in Salt Lake Valley July 24, 1847.

A pageant called "The Message of the Ages" was given for the entire week of April 6th, in the Salt Lake Mormon Tabernacle, depicting the features as I have just reviewed them.

Arrangements had been made by the "first presidency of the church" for a uniform service to be held in all the "stakes of zion" throughout the world commemorating the birth of the church.

So we look upon one hundred years of a heathen cult in a Christian land and how very little we have done to warn the Christian world of a church that teaches that "God is a man of parts and passions, flesh and bones just as any other man; that every male member of the Mormon church is an embryo god; that God has wives many; that Adam is the god of this world and the only god with whom we have to do; that when Adam came into the garden of Eden, he brought Eve, **one of his wives,** with him; that, at the wedding of Cana, Jesus married three women; that the two saviors of the world, Jesus and Joseph, came through polygamy, Jesus as the direct descendant of David and his plural wife Bathsheba, and Joseph as the direct descendant of Jesus and one of his plural wives; that the Holy Spirit is a substance like electricity, etc., and that no person can receive it unless it is given by one of their ordained priests; that no one will ever enter Heaven unless they accept the covenant of polygamy; that women must be saved through their husbands; that to disobey the priesthood and its orders is to destroy God; that their prophet, Heber J. Grant, stands today as the living oracle-prophet, seer and revelator to all the world, and he, alone, speaks for God."

When will the Church established by Jesus Christ once and for all time, when will all the followers of our meek and lowly Jesus, when, oh when! will we all awaken and teach every child in America that the Bible is the only **true word of God** and that there is only **one true way of salvation** and that is through a belief in the Lord Jesus Christ?

DRY POINTS

(*Continued from page 5*)

ing in place of prohibition, South Carolina had more than four times as many places selling liquor illegally as legally.

Dr. R. H. Martin, President of The National Reform Association, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

"The records show that in the year 1900 there were in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, in which Pittsburgh is located, 1,047 licensed saloons. According to the Retail Liquor Dealer's Association of Allegheny County there were in that same year and in the same county **2,300 unlicensed dealers selling li-**

quor in violation of the law, every day of the year, Sunday and election days included."

Liquor Dealers Always Notorious Violators of Law

Richard Lloyd Jones, Editor and Publisher of the Tulsa Tribune:

"There never was any law the liquor traffic respected or obeyed and there never will be. Liquor is constitutionally lawless."

Edward Keating, former Representative of Congress from Colorado, Editor of Labor, Washington, D.C. who introduced himself as "an old reporter and editor with forty years' experience in the "newspaper game":

"I was not a pioneer in the 'Dry' movement. I embraced prohibition reluctantly and only after experience had taught me that the men in control of the liquor business would obey no law—human or divine.

"I will gladly yield the floor if someone on the other side will undertake to give one instance where the liquor interests voluntarily obeyed a law regulating their business.

"As a matter of fact the brewer, the distiller and the dive-keeper by their persistent refusal to obey any regulation, however mild, aroused the American people to the point where they were willing to write into the organic law a provision outlawing vile traffic.

"No man of sense imagined that the adoption of the 18th Amendment would automatically reform this criminal crew. Of course, they are corrupting enforcement officers, bribing prosecuting officials and 'fixing' courts.

"But the point I want to make is that they were doing exactly the same thing, only on a much more extensive scale, for forty years before prohibition was adopted."

Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy said:

"I might quote testimony by the ream to show that the liquor interests deserved the sentence of death, but I quote only two witnesses. The President of the National Retail Liquor Dealers' Association said in 1916, after many states had gone dry and national prohibition was in the offing: "The brewers defied law and order, encouraged violation of law, furnished their products to persons who have no regard for decency, and are greedy to increase their output.' The Secretary of the Brewers' Association of Wisconsin said: "The retail liquor dealers are not worthy of consideration. They are bums and beggars."

Dr. Ella A. Boole, President, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union:

"Restore the legal sale of intoxicating liquors, even under State Control with moderate restrictions, and every restriction will be violated. It was so before prohibition; it is so now."

Wets Threaten Civil War

Prof. Horace D. Taft, Headmaster of the Taft School for Boys in Connecticut and Brother of the late President and Chief Justice Taft said:

"I should like at the beginning to say a word about the testimony that has been offered by those opposing the Eighteenth Amendment . . . . it contains so much heat and so little light that it only makes confusion worse confounded. That large numbers of prominent people are opposed to the law in varying degrees of violent emotion, we all know. Your Committee is being told of Civil War and flaming revolt. Our cocktail heroes are linked with the Christian martyrs, the men of '76 and the leaders of the anti-slavery party, a connection that argues a lack of sense of humor."

Edward Keating stated:

"The liquor men, backed by most of the political machines, defended by the most widely circulated newspapers, financed by apparently bottomless 'slush funds' fought to the last ditch and were finally crushed by the weight of their own iniquities rather than by the skill and strength of the opposition.

"Now, ten years after the decision was rendered, they are back here boasting of their contempt for law and trying to bluff the American people with threats of civil war if they are not permitted to have their way.

"I am not a prophet, but I think I am safe in predicting that if these hotheaded sons of John Barleycorn were to muster their forces tomorrow and march down Fifth Avenue under banners which demanded 'Booze or Blood' the first traffic cop they encountered would herd them into a patrol wagon."

THIRD

Dry Points

CONGRESSIONAL WET AND DRY HEARING

February 12 to April 16, 1930

Those opposing national prohibition before the House Judiciary Committee were agreed only on one thing—they were against prohibition. They had no constructive program, no substitute for prohibition on which they could agree. They proposed almost as many substitutes as there were witnesses testifying against prohibition. The substitute most frequently brought forward, the one on which the wets seem most likely to pin their faith for the future, was Government Control, such as Canada now has and such as we once had in South Carolina.

Government Control in Canada a Failure

Hon. E. C. Drury, former Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario, Canada, appeared before the Committee and testified that Government Control in Canada is a failure.

Its best chance of success was in the Province of Ontario where the people were promised an advance temperance measure and there was an honest attempt at control. Government Control came into operation in Ontario in 1927. For a number of years previous to 1927, Ontario was under a kind of prohibition. From that date the liquor business of Ontario has been under Government Control, the government having a monopoly of it.

Under Government Control, Mr. Drury said:

"Crime is increasing, drunkenness is increasing, violations of liquor laws are increasing, motor accidents are increasing."

"Sales are tremendous and increasing. In 1928, $48,995,591 worth of liquor was sold. In 1929 the amount was $55,360,569.91." (At the Ontario per capita rate of consumption the United States' liquor bill would be $2,225,000,000 per year.)

"Arrests for drunkenness, which were 11,370 in 1923 increased to 15,931 in 1928.

"Jail commitments for 1926, the last full year of prohibition were 11,371. In 1928, the first full year of Government Control, they were 23,786.

"In 1926 deaths from motor accidents were 298. In 1928 they were 477. In 1929 they were 561.

"Effective Control is indeed impossible. All we have is government sale—with consumption in the home or the hotel bedroom. No longer is drink a man's vice. Women and children are exposed to it.

"Whatever the solution of the drink problem may be, it is not Government Control."

South Carolina Dispensary a Failure

The most notable example of government ownership and control of the liquor traffic in the United States was in South Carolina from 1893 to 1905. The law enacted made the sale of all beverages containing alcohol, at either wholesale or retail, a state monopoly. The state appointed a commission and set up state machinery to dispense liquors and to throw around their sale every possible safeguard to eliminate the evils connected with the traffic.

Daniel C. Roper, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States presented testimony to show the utter failure of the South Carolina Dispensary System. Extracts from his testimony follow:

"This Dispensary Law was placed on the statute books of South Carolina and put into operation under the administration and by the able assistance of Governor Benjamin R. Tillman, the leader of the state political reform movement. No cause ever had a more forceful or more conscientious proponent and defender as long as he thought the system was defensible."

One year after the law went into effect a "whiskey rebellion" broke out in South Carolina in which citizens and constables were killed and wounded. The Governor ordered out the State Militia to help the State Constabularly. Many of the officers and men refused to respond to the call.

"The situation which confronted the Governor and his officers in the first year of the enforcement of the law is best told by Governor Tillman in the following excerpts from his message to the Legislature in 1894:

" 'The liquor dealers have resisted its enforcement and tried to evade it by every device that cunning and greed can suggest; and they have had as active sympathizers a large proportion of the people and police of nearly all the cities and towns in the state . . . .

" 'The whiskey rebellion had broken out in full fury; and for twenty-four hours men held their breaths, not only in this state, but throughout the United States; for it appeared that we were on the verge of civil war.'

"Illicit sale of whiskey sprang up very rapidly. The supplies for these 'blind tigers' were first secured from 'moonshine stills.' In a short time the illicit sellers discovered it would be to their interest to buy supplies from the dispensaries. An understanding was alleged to have been reached that the 'blind tigers' would supply themselves exclusively from the dispensaries and that the dispensaries would in turn protect the 'blind tigers' from the clutches of the law; and thus the dispensaries degenerated largely into supply stations for 'blind tigers.' The belief grew that the management of the dispensaries degenerated into a graft machine, using every effort to increase sales and make profits."

While the Dispensary System lasted 12 years, very early in its administration the public conscience began to revolt against it. In the warfare for its repeal Governor Tillman, by this time a United States Senator, was heartily enlisted and was largely instrumental in securing the passage of the act in 1907 which abolished the State Dispensary.

Prohibition or the Saloon?

Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy:

"There is but one alternative to national prohibition. It is a return to the old saloon with its heart breaks, its product of drunkenness and poverty, its corrupt dominance of city government and its dictation of politics."

Francis Scott McBride, General Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of America:

"Those who are opposing prohibition are advocating the liquor traffic without the saloon as a strategic policy rather than one of honesty of purpose."

Col. Raymond Robins:

"Even the wets persistently declare that they do not want the saloon, but a rose by any other name is still a rose. The saloon is simply a place where men drink liquor and more liquor—and modification, the Canadian system, or straight out repeal would bring us the saloon again in one form or another, even if we painted it white, sold lilies at the door and had Uncle Sam for a bartender."

William Howard Taft and Prohibition

Prof. Horace D. Taft introduced a letter written by his brother, the late President and Chief Justice Taft, on November 28, 1928 to Irving Fisher. In this letter the former President after referring to a letter he had written against prohibition before the adoption of the 18th Amendment said:

"But the result (of the adoption of the 18th Amendment) is glorious and points the only way we have to work out the problem presented. The solution requires a great deal of time and patience. The habits of an important section of a congested part of the country can not be changed over night or in years. The reform and the adaption of society to that at which the Amendment aims must be gradual. The temptation of corruption will drag it out. While looking ahead at the Amendment I dispaired of any success, I really think that it is possible, if we keep at it, to achieve a satisfactory result."

AULD LANG SYNE

(*Continued from page 2*)

sociation, declared that there were 6,000 bootleggers in Philadelphia. This indicates that in that city nearly 6,000 were protected from even Federal interference.

It is extremely doubtful if there are as many now the country over. The saloon was just like a dilapidated barn, a cover for the rats. Now, they are without cover.

The talk of a law-abiding trade which lawfully supplied the demand for liquor, is what our high school youngsters today call the "big bunk." Here is a sample.

"We desire to inform the New York Voice that we do not consider the sale of liquor on Sunday a crime."—Wine and Spirit Gazette.

Senator George W. Plunkett, a Tammany man from the 17th District, New York City, was asked what he thought of the "pure beer legislation." He said, "I am against pure beer. It's all a humbug. The people be ———. I stand with the brewers who are fighting pure beer legislation."

—Wine and Spirit Gazette.

We might multiply these, but we who remember the open saloon, know that a law abiding saloon keeper, was like James Whitcomb Riley's "Squidgicum Squees" that swaller themselves, "there wasn't any such creature."

The liquor trade and its friends are making a great hulla-balloo about snoopers, spying, infringement of the rights of the citizens and all other expressions which will reflect unfavorably on detective work and and might possibly win some cheap sympathy for them. They never complain about defective work when it is used to protect them.